IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Chen et al.**	§	Group Art Unit: **2624**
	§	
Serial No.: **10/756,919**	§	Examiner: **Amara Abdi**
	§	
Filed: **January 14, 2004**	§	Attorney Docket No.: **AUS920031038US1**
	§	
For: **Method and Apparatus for Reducing**	§	
Reference Character Dictionary		
Comparisons During Handwriting		
Recognition		

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Sir:

      Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

      This request is being filed with a Notice of Appeal.

      The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Respectfully submitted,

/Brandon G. Williams/

Brandon G. Williams
Registration No. 48,844
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, Texas 75380
(972) 385-8777
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANTS

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Chen et al.** § Group Art Unit: **2624**
§
Serial No.: **10/756,919** § Examiner: **Amara Abdi**
§
Filed: **January 14, 2004** § Attorney Docket No.: **AUS920031038US1**
§
For: **Method and Apparatus for** §
Reducing Reference Character
Dictionary Comparisons During
Handwriting Recognition

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

REASONS IN SUPPORT OF APPLICANTS'
PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Sir:

This document is submitted in support of the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review filed concurrently with a Notice of Appeal in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 41.31 and with the rules set out in the OG of July 12, 2005 for the New Appeal Brief Conference Pilot Program.

No fee or extension of time is believed due for this request. However, if any fee or extension of time for this request is required, Applicants request that this be considered a petition therefor. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee, which may be required, or credit any refund, to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

1

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request a Pre-Appeal Brief Review (hereinafter "Request") of the claims finally rejected in the Final Office Action mailed June 19, 2007. The Request is provided herewith in accordance with the rules set out in the OG dated July 12, 2005. The Request is needed because the final rejections are clearly in error.

A.   Claim Status

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 6-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by *Ito et al.*, Character Input Apparatus/Method and Computer-Readable Storage Medium, U.S. Patent No. 6,694,056 (February 17, 2004) (hereinafter "*Ito*"). Claims 1, 10 and 16 are independent claims. Although the ground of rejection stated on page 3 of the Final Office Action mailed June 19, 2007, does not specifically include claims 2-4, and 6-20, the explanation of the rejection presented thereafter does mention those claims, and it is assumed that the rejection was intended to include claims 2-4, and 6-20.

Dependent claims 5 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Ito* in view *Izumi*, Character Recognition Apparatus and Character Recognition Method, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0099398 (May 29, 2003) (hereinafter "*Izumi*"). Claim 5 depends from claim 1.

B.   Reasons why the Final Rejection of Claims 1-4 and 6-20 as Being Anticipated by *Ito* is Clearly in Error:

The Examiner has not established that *Ito* anticipates the rejected claims 1-4 and 6-20, because *Ito* does not teach the claimed features of, "wherein *each of the plurality of respective reference parameter sets* corresponding to the reference character strokes *has an associated reference sequence number*," or "responsive to identification of the stroke sequence number, *comparing the stroke parameter set* with at least those of the plurality of respective reference parameter sets *having their associated reference sequence number equal to the stroke sequence number*, wherein the comparison excludes at least one of the reference parameter sets", as required by independent claims 1, 10 and 16. Instead, *Ito* teaches recording the order of a plurality of strokes and then differentiating the characters based on the elapsed time between the different strokes.

Ito's character numbers, which the Examiner has read to correspond to Applicants' stroke sequence numbers, simply show an arbitrary reference number by which *Ito* identifies a character within *Ito*'s character dictionary. This is, in effect, a simple numeric substitution wherein the

2

substituted character number identifies the character. The character number identifies the whole character, as shown in Figure 7 of *Ito*.

In contrast, Applicants' stroke sequence number is the sequential entered order of the individual strokes of a single character. By combining the sequential entered order of the individual strokes of a single character with rules governing the entered stroke order for characters, non-matching characters can be dynamically eliminated from consideration of the probable matching characters when the stroke sequence number does not match the rule governing the sequence order.

Ito's stroke numbers, which the Examiner has read to correspond to Applicants' reference sequence number, is actually more akin to the Applicants' stroke sequence number. *Ito*'s stroke number is an identification of the sequential order of the entered strokes.

In contrast, the Applicants' reference sequence number is the proper stroke number of a stroke sequence for writing a character according to an accepted stroke order rule. By comparing the actual order in which strokes are entered to a proper stroke order, non-matching characters can be dynamically eliminated from consideration of the probable matching characters when the stroke sequence number does not match the reference sequence number.

Ito does not teach the claimed feature of "*comparing the stroke parameter set* with at least those of the plurality of respective reference parameter sets *having their associated reference sequence number equal to the stroke sequence number*," wherein the comparison excludes at least one of the reference parameter sets" as required in claim 1. As stated above, the Examiner has read the *Ito*'s character numbers to be Applicants' stroke sequence numbers. Furthermore the Examiner has read *Ito*'s stroke numbers to be Applicants' reference sequence number. The Examiner then cites the following section of *Ito* in support of the claimed feature "*comparing the stroke parameter set* with at least those of the plurality of respective reference parameter sets *having their associated reference sequence number equal to the stroke sequence number*":

> On judging that none of these user strokes is a first stroke, or if the number of strokes K is judged to be "1" in step S1605, the interval-based character detecting unit 108 compares the combinations of stroke candidates for the I to (I+K-1) the user strokes with the order of strokes in the present registered character cJ in the character dictionary 102. If a combination of stroke candidates matches, the registered character cJ is chosen as a character candidate (S1608).

Ito, col. 12, ll. 59-65.

The passage cited makes no mention of either of *Ito*'s character numbers, or *Ito*'s stroke numbers. Instead, this passage teaches examining a series of sequentially entered strokes, and then comparing those to a database. If the sum of the sequentially entered strokes equals the character within the database, then the character is chosen as a "candidate character". This method takes no consideration of rules governing stroke order, contrary to the claimed features in Applicants' claim 1.

As stated, this passage makes no mention of either of *Ito*'s character numbers, or *Ito*'s stroke numbers. The cited passage therefore cannot possibly teach comparing *Ito*'s character numbers with *Ito*'s stroke numbers to determine whether the two values are equal. Because the cited passage is completely devoid of any disclosure regarding *Ito*'s character numbers and *Ito*'s stroke numbers, it is impossible for the cited passage to teach Applicants' claimed feature of "*comparing the stroke parameter set* with at least those of the plurality of respective reference parameter sets *having their associated reference sequence number equal to the stroke sequence number*...."

C.   Reasons why the Final Rejection of Claim 5 as Obvious over *Ito* in view of *Izumi* is Clearly in Error:

The Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting the claims because neither *Ito* nor *Izumi* teach the claimed features of, "wherein *each of the plurality of respective reference parameter sets* corresponding to the reference character strokes *has an associated reference sequence number*," or "responsive to identification of the stroke sequence number, *comparing the stroke parameter set* with at least those of the plurality of respective reference parameter sets *having their associated reference sequence number equal to the stroke sequence number*, wherein the comparison excludes at least one of the reference parameter sets", as required by claim 5 by virtue of its dependence from independent claim 1.

As shown above, *Ito* does not teach the stated features. Furthermore, without commenting on the additional features of claim 5, *Izumi* does not overcome the shown deficiencies of the limitations of claim 1 incorporated into claim 5. Therefore, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting the claim.

D. Conclusion

For at least the reasons indicated above, the Examiner has failed to establish that *Ito* anticipates the rejected claims 1-4 and 6-20. For similar reasons, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting the claim 5. Therefore, the claims should be allowable over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request that the Pre-Appeal Brief Panel withdraw the rejections. The Pre-Appeal Brief Conference Panel is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Panel such a telephone call would expedite or aid in the prosecution of this application.

DATE: September 19, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Brandon G. Williams/
Brandon G. Williams
Reg. No. 48,44
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants